



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,972	07/31/2001	Kurt A. Dobbins	110197.163	3787
23483	7590	08/22/2006	EXAMINER	
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP			DAVIS, ZACHARY A	
60 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	
BOSTON, MA 02109			PAPER NUMBER	
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,972	Applicant(s) DOBBINS ET AL.	
	Examiner Zachary A. Davis	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A response was received on 30 May 2006. By this response, Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 13-25 were previously withdrawn from further consideration as drawn to a nonelected invention. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1-12 are currently under examination in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 30 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to the rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Rajan et al, US Patent 6725425, and in particular with reference to independent Claim 1, Applicant argues that the enterprise rules disclosed by Rajan, for example at column 20, lines 29-32, as cited by the Examiner, represent a distinct concept from the claimed content access rules (see page 10 of the present response). However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that the plain meaning of the phrase "content access rules" would be "rules which are used to determine what content may be accessed and/or how such content may be accessed". The Examiner believes that the enterprise rules cited in Rajan similarly are used to determine how content is accessed (i.e. how the returned results, or content, are "made available to users", or accessed; again, see Rajan, column 20, lines 29-32).

In reference to independent Claim 11, Applicant argues that although Rajan mentions personalized web pages, for example at column 5, line 66-column 6, line 8, as cited by the Examiner, Rajan does not disclose that portal web pages are generated based on content resource subscription information (see page 10 of the present response). However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the Examiner notes that the cited portion explicitly refers to a subscriber, therefore at least implying that some sort of content and/or resource is subscribed to. Second, the Examiner further notes that Rajan further discloses that the personalized portal page provides access to various other content resources to which the user has subscribed (see column 6, lines 21-58, noting especially lines 45-50, where the portal page presents a listing of user-subscribed pages).

In reference to Claims 3 and 5, Applicant argues that Rajan does not disclose using a switch or IP address in an authorization determination. However, the Examiner notes that Rajan discloses that the use of switches and IP routers, for example, and authorization by, for example, user name and password, are well known in the art (see column 5, line 55-column 6, line 2), and that it would be inherently known to use such technologies in determining authorization.

In reference to Claim 10, Applicant argues that Rajan does not disclose blocking access by another user to a source of resources. However, the Examiner notes that the cited portion of Rajan describes determining whether a user is allowed to access a source based on external authorization information; at least implicitly, if a user is not allowed to access the source, then the user will be blocked from access the source.

Art Unit: 2137

The Examiner again notes that Rajan discloses that the use of switches is well known in the art (column 5, lines 55-65).

Therefore, for the reasons detailed above, the Examiner maintains the rejections as set forth below.

Drawings

3. The objection to the drawings for informalities is withdrawn in light of the newly submitted drawings.
4. The Examiner again notes that, although they are not required, reference characters (e.g. numerals) in the drawings and reference to the various elements of the drawings by reference numeral in the specification would add clarity to the disclosure.

Specification

5. The objection to the disclosure for informalities is withdrawn in light of the amendments to the specification.
6. Applicant's cooperation is again requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite, is withdrawn in light of the amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rajan et al, US Patent 6725425.

In reference to Claim 1, Rajan discloses a method including receiving a request from a user to access a source of content resources (column 6, lines 21-24; column 23, lines 66-67), determining that the user is authorized for access (column 6, lines 24-25; column 23, line 67-column 24, line 2), generating content access rules (column 20, lines 29-32), processing the rules to generate a portal web page based on content element data applicable to the user (column 6, lines 41-58), and returning the portal web page to the user (column 6, lines 24-28).

In reference to Claim 2, Rajan further discloses determining if the user has subscribed to content resources (column 6, lines 9-20).

In reference to Claims 3 and 5, Rajan further discloses determining whether the user is an authorized user using an IP address and switch (see column 5, lines 55-59).

In reference to Claim 4, Rajan further discloses that the portal web page includes links to content resources to which the user has subscribed (column 6, lines 45-50).

In reference to Claims 6-8, Rajan further discloses that the content element data can specify content type, billing information, or location information (column 6, lines 50-55; column 9, lines 40-47).

In reference to Claim 9, Rajan further discloses allowing the user to make a subscription change (column 7, lines 30-34).

In reference to Claim 10, Rajan further discloses blocking another user's access based on external authorization information (see column 18, lines 39-49).

In reference to Claim 11, Rajan discloses a method including generating a first portal web page for a first user based on subscription information for the first user and generating a second portal web page for a second user based on subscription information for the second user (column 5, line 66-column 6, line 8, where portal pages are individualized for a particular user).

In reference to Claim 12, Rajan further discloses basing the generation of portal web pages on rule information (column 20, lines 29-32).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZAD
zad

ce L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER